



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

attempted to effectuate it in defiance of established legal principles, *Ridgeway v. Lamphear*, 99 Ind. 251. Still other jurisdictions show an inclination to take advantage of the words of distribution to construe "heirs" as a word of purchase. *Fulton v. Harman*, 44 Md. 251.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT—"ARISING OUT OF EMPLOYMENT".—An employee of a master engaged in the business of repairing furnaces, while on his way to do a job of repairing, left the vehicle provided by his employer, to buy tobacco for personal use. In crossing the street to reach the tobacco store he was struck by an automobile and killed. In a proceeding by the widow and children to obtain an award of compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act, *held*, two judges dissenting, there should be no award, the accident not having been one arising "in the course and out of the employment". *In re Betts*, (Ind. App., 1918), 118 N. E. 551.

Emphasis was laid chiefly upon the fact that as the deceased was exposed only to the same hazards on the street as any pedestrian, his employment could not be said to have any causal connection with the injury, hence the accident was not one arising "out of his employment". Among the cases chiefly relied upon for this conclusion are the English cases repudiated by the House of Lords in *Dennis v. J. A. White & Co.*, [1917], A. C. 479, commented upon in 16 MICH. L. REV. 179. See *Martin v. Lovibond & Sons*, [1914], 2 K. B. 227, where compensation was awarded for an injury received by a drayman in the street while returning to his team after getting a glass of beer.